ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA648413 01/06/2015

Filing date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	92056509
Party	Plaintiff Autodesk, Inc.
Correspondence Address	JOHN L SLAFSKY WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH ROSATI 650 PAGE MILL RD PALO ALTO, CA 94304 1050 UNITED STATES jslafsky@wsgr.com, trademarks@wsgr.com
Submission	Reply in Support of Motion
Filer's Name	JOHN L SLAFSKY
Filer's e-mail	jslafsky@wsgr.com, trademarks@wsgr.com
Signature	/JOHN L SLAFSKY/
Date	01/06/2015
Attachments	Petitioner Reply in Further Support of Its Motion to Compel Discovery.pdf(132484 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AUTODESK, INC.,) Cancellation No. 92056509
Petitioner,	
V.	
3D SYSTEMS, INC.,	
Respondent.)
)

PETITIONER'S REPLY IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY

Petitioner Autodesk, Inc. ("Petitioner") submits this memorandum in further support of its December 15, 2014 motion, pursuant to TBMP § 523, to compel discovery.

ARGUMENT

Respondent 3D Systems, Inc. ("Respondent") opposes this motion but does not deny any of the following:

- The Board's October 30, 2014 Discovery Order (the "Discovery Order") compelled Respondent to disclose certain documents and information to Petitioner by November 30, 2014, so that Petitioner could then conduct "follow-up" discovery during the November 30 December 30 time period;
- The Discovery Order states that in the event Respondent fails to provide Petitioner with full and complete discovery responses, as required by the Order, Respondent will be barred from relying upon or later producing any documents or facts at trial that were withheld from such discovery;
- Respondent did not, in fact, provide Petitioner with full and complete discovery responses, as required by the Order;
- On November 10, 2014, Petitioner duly served notices of deposition of Respondent's witnesses for December 2014;
- Respondent did not serve written objections or otherwise respond to the deposition notices as required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the TBMP. Having

not heard back from Respondent about these depositions, Petitioner wrote a letter to Respondent on November 24, 2014, advising Respondent that continued failure to acknowledge or respond to the deposition notices would, under governing law, be deemed waiver of its objections, if any;

- Respondent ignored the deposition notices and follow-up letter, and instead prepared a Motion for Reconsideration challenging the Discovery Order. *See* Dkt. 30; and
- On December 10, 2014, four weeks after service of the deposition notices, shortly before Christmas and the Board's discovery cut-off, Respondent finally advised Petitioner that it would not be producing witnesses for deposition as noticed.

As a result, Petitioner could not meaningfully proceed with "follow-up" discovery (as contemplated by the Discovery Order) and had no choice but to seek Board intervention once again.

In light of Petitioner's first motion to compel, Respondent's pending motion for reconsideration of the resulting Discovery Order, and now this second motion to compel, Petitioner has been forced to litigate the very same discovery issues *three times*. As a result, this cancellation proceeding has been delayed repeatedly and has been pending in the pre-trial stage for over two years. The Board thus should: grant this motion; preclude Respondent from relying on withheld documents or information at trial; make an adverse inference regarding such documents and information at trial; direct Respondent to make its witnesses available promptly for pre-trial deposition; and direct the parties to proceed to trial shortly thereafter.

CONCLUSION

In sum, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board grant this Motion in entirety and:

(1) preclude Respondent from relying on such documents or information called for by the

Discovery Order in connection with defense of this proceeding; (2) make an adverse inference
regarding same; (3) direct Respondent to make available the three designated party witnesses

(two individuals and a 30(b)(6) witnesses) for discovery deposition, on consecutive days within a

30-day time period, before trial; and (4) reschedule the parties' trial disclosures and trial testimony periods for the earliest possible dates.

Dated: January 6, 2015

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI **Professional Corporation**

Luke A. Liss

Stephanie S. Brannen Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

650 Page Mill Road

Palo Alto, California 94304-1050 Tel: (650) 493-9300

Fax: (650) 493-6811 trademarks@wsgr.com

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, Elvira Minjarez, declare:

I am employed in Santa Clara County. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, 650 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, California, 94304-1050.

I am readily familiar with Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati's practice for collection and processing of correspondence with the United States Postal Service. In the ordinary course of business, correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on this date.

On this date, I caused to be personally served **PETITIONER'S REPLY IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY** on the person(s)

listed below by placing the document(s) described above in an envelope addressed as indicated below, which I sealed. I placed the envelope(s) for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service on this day, following ordinary business practices at Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati.

Jason M. Sneed SNEED PLLC 610 Jetton St., Suite 120-107 Davidson, North Carolina 28036

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Palo Alto, California on January 6, 2015.

Elierat Bujarez